

DOCKET NO. D-674A

**COMBINED DECLARATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY IN
APPLICATION CONTAINING ADDITIONAL SUBJECT MATTER**

We, the below named inventors, hereby declare that:

Our residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to our names; that we verily believe that we are the original, first and sole inventors of the application entitled:

**STACK FORMED FROM CONNECTED
GROUPS OF INTERFOLDED SHEETS**

filed and claimed in an application filed _____, and assigned Serial No. _____; which is a continuation of U.S. Serial No. 09/405,827, filed September 24, 1999. We have reviewed and understand the contents of the specification including the claims, as amended by any amendments specifically referred to in this Declaration; that we acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of the application in accordance with Section 1.56 (a). We hereby claim foreign priority benefits under title 35, United States Code §119 of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate listed below and have also identified below any foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed:

Priority Claimed

Number	Country	(Day/Month/Year Filed)	YES	NO
--------	---------	------------------------	-----	----

We hereby appoint as our attorney(s), with full powers of substitution and revocation, to prosecute this application and to transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected therewith:

John B. Lungmus (Reg. No. 18,566), John W. Chestnut (Reg. No. 24,096), Richard B. Hoffman (Reg. No. 26,910), Vasilios D. Dossas (Reg. No. 30,745), and Jeremy R. Kriegel (Reg. No. 39,257) all of the 100 South Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

Direct all telephone calls to John W. Chestnut at telephone no. (312) 456-8000.

Address all correspondence to:

John W. Chestnut
TILTON, FALLON, LUNGMUS & CHESTNUT
100 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 960
Chicago, Illinois 60606-4002

We hereby declare that all statements made herein of our own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Date

Signature

Full Name of First Inventor: GRANTLAND A. CRAIG

Residence:

Post Office Address: Same

Citizenship: United States of America

Date

Signature

Full Name of Second Inventor: JAMES E. HERTEL

Residence:

Post Office Address: Same

Citizenship: United States of America

Date _____ Signature _____

Full Name of Third Inventor: GARY E. JOHNSON

Residence: _____ ✓

Post Office Address: Same

Citizenship: United States of America

Date _____ Signature _____

Full Name of Fourth Inventor: WAYNE W. LUEBKE

Residence: _____ ✓

Post Office Address: Same

Citizenship: United States of America

Date _____ Signature _____

Full Name of Fifth Inventor: PETER A. HEATH

Residence: _____ ✓

Post Office Address: Same

Citizenship: United States of America

Date _____ Signature _____

Full Name of Sixth Inventor: THOMAS D. HUEMPFNER

Residence: _____ ✓

Post Office Address: Same

Citizenship: United States of America

Date

Signature

Full Name of Seventh Inventor: JOHN H. WUNDERLICH

Residence:

Post Office Address: Same

Citizenship: United States of America

DUTY TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION MATERIAL TO PATENTABILITY - 37
C.F.R. SECTION 1.56

1. A patent by its very nature is affected with a public interest. The public interest is best served, and the most effective patent examination occurs when, at the time an application is being examined, the Office is aware of and evaluates the teachings of all information material to patentability.
2. Each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability.
3. The duty to disclose information exists with respect to each pending claim until the claim is canceled or withdrawn from consideration, or the application becomes abandoned.
4. Information material to the patentability of a claim that is canceled or withdrawn from consideration need not be submitted if the information is not material to the patentability of any claim remaining under consideration in the application.
5. There is NO DUTY TO SUBMIT INFORMATION WHICH IS NOT MATERIAL TO THE PATENTABILITY OF ANY EXISTING CLAIM.
6. The duty to disclose all information known to be material to patentability is deemed to be satisfied if all information known to be material to patentability of any claim issued in a patent was cited to the PTO or submitted to the PTO in the manner prescribed by sections 1.97(b)-(d) and 1.98.
7. No patent will be granted on an application in connection with which fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted through bad faith or intentional misconduct.
8. The PTO encourages applicants to carefully examine:
 - a. prior art cited in search reports of a foreign patent office in a counterpart application, and
 - b. the closest information over which individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application believe any pending claim patentably defines, to make sure that any material information contained therein is disclosed to the PTO.

DRAFT - 4/2008

9. According to section 1.56, information is material to patentability when it is not cumulative to information already of record or being made of record in the application, and

a. It establishes, by itself or in combination with other information, a prima facie case of unpatentability of a claim; or

b. It refutes, or is inconsistent with, a position the applicant takes in:

(1) Opposing an argument of unpatentability relied on by the Office, or

(2) Asserting an argument of patentability.

10. A prima facie case of unpatentability is established when the information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of evidence, burden-of-proof standard, given each term in the claim its broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification, and before any consideration is given to evidence which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability.

11. Individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application within the meaning of section 1.56 are:

a. Each inventor named in the application;

b. Each attorney or agent who prepares or prosecutes the application; and

c. Every other person who is substantively involved in the preparation or prosecution of the application and who is associated with the inventor, with the assignee or with anyone to whom there is an obligation to assign the application.

12. Individuals other than the attorney, agent or inventor may comply with section 1.56 by disclosing information to the attorney, agent, or inventor.